

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

WILLIAM ROSS PHILLIPS, JR.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B304716

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. SA099236)

THE COURT:

In 2018, defendant and appellant William Ross Phillips, Jr., entered a bank, brandished a firearm, and demanded and obtained money from a teller, before fleeing. He was charged with four counts of robbery (Pen. Code, § 211) with the personal use of a firearm (Pen. Code, § 12022.53, subd. (b)). Seven prior convictions for bank robbery were alleged as prior serious felony convictions and “strikes.” (Pen. Code, §§ 667, 1170.12.)

Defendant waived his preliminary hearing and trial rights, pled no contest to one of the charges, and admitted one prior strike and three prior serious felony convictions. He was sentenced to the upper term of five years on the charge, doubled to 10 years because of the prior strike. The sentence was enhanced by 15 years for the prior serious felony convictions.

Defendant filed a notice of appeal from the sentencing order.

Counsel was appointed to represent defendant in connection with this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no arguable issues were raised. On September 1, 2020, appointed counsel advised defendant of his opportunity to file a supplemental brief.

On September 15, 2020, defendant submitted a supplemental brief in which he asks that his “5 year prior [be] stricken. Nothing else.” He seems to claim that his trial counsel should have realized that he should not have admitted this prior because the number associated with that prior was actually a federal inmate number, not a case number. He further asserts that he has written four letters to his appointed appellate counsel, but, based upon the arguments in the opening brief, it appears that counsel never received them.

We have examined the entire record and we are satisfied that defendant’s appellate counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441 (*Wende*)). We are not convinced by the argument raised in defendant’s supplemental brief. While there may have been some sort of issue with the case number, defendant does not dispute the fact that he was convicted of bank robbery. Thus, we decline defendant’s unfounded request that

appointed counsel be ordered to file a different supplemental brief or that a new appellate attorney be appointed to represent him.

Defendant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment and sentence entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123–124.)

The trial court's order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

ASHMANN-GERST, J.

LUI, P. J.

CHAVEZ, J.